Meeting Minutes

Project: *K-rail Staking Configurations*
Date: *11/02/05*
Time: *1 PM*
Attendees: *John Jewell, Bob Meline, Malinda Gallaher, Greg Berry, Matt Schmitz, Ken Kochevar, Gary Gauthier*

1. Review of videos/photos from last test (#675)
   - Vehicle rolled appeared high
   - High roll is usual for safety-shaped barriers
   - Roll comparison from all tests desired by committee
   - Roll comparison from other PCB (NJ and F shapes) desired by committee
   - Develop chart for side-by-side comparison of all tests (occupant impact velocity, ridedown acceleration, vehicle roll, maximum static and dynamic displacements)
   - Barrier deflection (13.44") for test 675 was okay

2. Discussion on different staking configurations
   - Simple configuration to prevent confusion
   - Only one staking configuration per median and excavation

3. Criteria for passing
   - 350 criteria isn't enough
   - Committee needs to determine a criteria to pass tests

4. Important factors
   - Distance between barrier and excavation. (Greg – 3" is a good distance. 0" is too close to the excavation and edge support could be an issue.)
   - Barrier deflection into excavation

5. Future testing
   - Test current standards (2' between barrier and excavation) for "zippering"?
   - Another excavation configuration will be discussed if test 675 doesn't pass the *criteria*

6. Pro and cons between 551 (fully staked with uncapped stakes) and 673 (fully staked, every other section, capped stakes)
   - 551
     i. Pros: Simple design and stakes
   - 673
     i. Pros: Less holes, installation time, and repairs. Easier to remove, due to stake cap (gripping point)
     ii. Cons: Stakes are more complex and will cost more to manufacture.

7. Stake design
   - Welds will have to comply to current specs
   - How long will the stakes last? (fatigue)
   - Leave stake design to the contractor?